

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.

REMARKS

I.

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-14, 17-34, and 36-43 are presently active in the application. Claims 5, 9, 15, 16, and 35 have been canceled.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement of the papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

Applicant notes with appreciation that the subject matter in claims 19-38 and 40 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and if further amended to overcome the rejection on indefiniteness under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner's objections to the drawings are noted. The objections have been overcome by adding the reference numbers "2" and "26" to the specification. The reference numeral 2 has been added at page 12, line 11 and the reference numeral 26 has been added in the paragraph beginning on page 29, line 10.

The Examiner's objections to Claims 5, 9, and 35 under 35 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) have been noted. Claims 5, 9, and 35 have been canceled.

II.

Claims 17-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The indefiniteness noted by the Examiner in Claim 17 has been removed by deleting the phrase "image forming" from the preamble of Claim 17. The indefiniteness noted by the Examiner in Claims 34, 37, and 39 has been removed by the present amendment. The other claims in this group of claims were deemed indefinite by the

examiner based on the indefiniteness in one or more of claims 17, 34, 37, and 39.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

III.

Claims 15-16 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kawano et al. (U.S. 6,463,247). This rejection is moot because claims 15 and 16 have been canceled.

IV.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Aerens et al. (U.S. 5,828,937). This rejection is moot because claim 16 has been canceled.

V.

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawano et al. in view of Bannai (U.S. 5,315,322). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites “wherein said first roller and said second roller each have allowable eccentricity reduced to a range that does not effect a variation of a speed of the belt.” Neither Kawano et al. nor Bannai teaches or suggests a device for driving an endless belt that includes rollers that have their allowable eccentricity reduced to a range that does not effect a variation of a speed of the belt. In this respect, Kawano et al. does not discuss the eccentricity of either a first or a second roller. The disclosure in column 9 lines 4-35 of Bannai relied upon by the examiner likewise fails to teach or suggest either a first roller or a second roller having allowable eccentricity reduced to a range that does not effect a variation of a speed of the belt. The disclosure in Bannai relates to a system for reducing “an error ascribable to the eccentricity of the drive roller 2 which is presumably the greatest cause of speed fluctuation.” Bannai at column 9 lines 20-22. Therefore, the drive roller 2 disclosed by Bannai does not correspond to the first roller recited in claim 1 of the present application

because the drive roller 2 disclosed by Bannai does have an eccentricity which is the greatest cause of speed fluctuation of the drive belt. Moreover, neither of the cited references teaches or suggests a second roller that has allowable eccentricity reduced to a range that does not effect a variation of a speed of the belt as recited in claim 1. Thus, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 and 6-8 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. Therefore, those claims are allowable for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Moreover, the dependent claims include additional limitations which are not taught or suggested by the cited references. In particular, neither the dynamic balance structure recited in claim 3 nor the eccentricity adjusting mechanism recited in claim 6 is taught or suggested by the cited references.

Independent claim 10 recites “wherein said drive roller has allowable eccentricity reduced to a range that does not effect a variation of a speed of the belt.” Thus, claim 10 distinguishes over the cited references for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 11-14 depend directly or indirectly from claim 10. Therefore, those claims patentably distinguish over the cited references for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 10. Moreover, those dependent claims include additional limitations which further patentably distinguish over the applied references. In particular, neither the dynamic balance structure recited in claim 12 nor the dynamic balance structure recited in claim 14 is taught or suggested by the cited references.

VI.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawano et al. in view of Nishii (J.P. 7-210839). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

No motor structure is illustrated or described in the Kawano et al. reference. There is no teaching or suggestion in the references as to how the motor disclosed by Nishii could be incorporated into the structure disclosed by Kawano et al. That is, it is only through the improper use of hindsight using the teaching in applicant's disclosure that one would attempt to combine the drums 3 and 4 of Nishii with the drive belt disclosed by Kawano et al. Moreover, claim 17 recites "wherein at least one of said drive roller and said photoconductive drum is directly driven by an outer rotor coreless motor." However, the motor disclosed by Nishii is not an outer rotor coreless motor as recited in claim 17. Thus, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

VII.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawano et al. in view of Nishii, as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of McLaughlin et al. (U.S. 5,998,952). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 depends from claim 17. The McLaughlin et al. reference fails to make up for the deficiencies in Kawano et al. and Nishii with respect to the subject matter defined by claim 17. Accordingly, claim 18 patentably distinguishes over the references for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 17. Moreover, the McLaughlin et al. reference discloses a low rpm motor 22 used to assist steering the wheels of a vehicle as illustrated in Fig. 3. Thus, the disclosure in the McLaughlin et al. reference is unrelated to the subject matter defined by claim 18. Therefore, it is only through the improper use of hindsight using applicant's disclosure as a template that one would attempt to combine the disclosure of the McLaughlin et al. reference with the image forming apparatus disclosed in the Kawano et al. reference. Furthermore, the disclosure at column 12 line 62-column 13 line 7 of the McLaughlin et al. reference relied upon by the examiner relates to choosing a spatial frequency below which all

torque ripple is to be removed. The McLaughlin et al. reference does not teach or suggest torque ripples generated by an outer rotor coreless motor set at a spatial frequency close to a maximum value in an allowable, torque ripple spatial frequency range at a low frequency side, which does not effect image quality as defined by the subject matter of claim 18 and as described on page 56 lines 17-25 and illustrated in Fig. 29 of the present application. Thus, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 18 be withdrawn.

VIII.

Claim 39 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawano et al. in view of Nishii in view of Bannai. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 39 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter defined by claim 17 and the subject matter defined by claim 31. As amended, claim 39 clearly patentably distinguishes over the applied references.

IX.

Claim 19 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of original claims 17 and 18 and rewritten to overcome the indefiniteness noted by the examiner. Therefore, applicant submits that claim 19 and claims 20 and 21 dependent either directly or indirectly therefrom are allowable.

Claim 22 has been rewritten to incorporate the subject matter of original claims 17 and 18 and rewritten to overcome the indefiniteness noted by the examiner. Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 22 and claims 23 and 24 dependent either directly or indirectly therefrom are allowable.

Claim 25 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of original claims 17 and 18 and rewritten to overcome the indefiniteness noted by the examiner. Accordingly,

applicant submits that claim 25 and claims 26 and 27 dependent either directly or indirectly therefrom are allowable.

Claim 28 has been rewritten to incorporate the subject matter of original claims 17 and 18 and rewritten to overcome the indefiniteness noted by the examiner. Therefore, applicant submits that claim 28 and claim 29 dependent therefrom are allowable.

Claim 30 has been rewritten to incorporate the subject matter of original claim 17 and rewritten to overcome the indefiniteness noted by the examiner. Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 30 and claims 31 and 32 dependent either directly or indirectly therefrom are allowable.

Claim 33 has been rewritten to include the subject matter of original claim 17 and rewritten to overcome the indefiniteness noted by the examiner. Therefore, applicant submits that claim 33 and claim 34 dependent therefrom are allowable.

Claim 35 has been canceled.

Claim 36 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of original claim 17 and rewritten to overcome the indefiniteness noted by the examiner. Therefore, applicant submits that claim 36 and claims 37 and 38 dependent either directly or indirectly therefrom are allowable.

Claim 39 has been rewritten to incorporate the subject matter of original claims 17 and 31 and rewritten to overcome the indefiniteness noted by the examiner. As presently amended, applicant submits that claim 39 is allowable.

Claim 40 has not been rewritten but remains dependent from claim 39. Applicant submits that both claims 39 and 40 are allowable.

X.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-14, 17-34, and 36-43.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



22850

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "James R. Boler". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "James" and last name "Boler" clearly legible.

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
James R. Boler
Registration No. 37,058

Tel.: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
GJM/JRB/bt/wmp
I:\ATTY\JRB\215810US\215810US-AM 2 MAY 03.DOC